

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

A political Interpretation of Islam

A synopsis of the Error of interpretation

An English translation of

دین کی سیاسی تعبیر

خلاصہ تعبیر کی غلطی

مولانا وحید الدین خان

By

Dr. Saleem A Khanani

## CRITICISM

This short book is a synopsis of my book, 'the error of interpretation' in which I have summarized and provided an explanation of my objection Maulana Mawdudi's literature and why it is objectionable.

Maulana Abdul Majid Daryabadi once pointed out the sick mentality that affects even the most righteous scholars of the Islamic community: the inability to tolerate constructive criticism. (صدق جدید October 13, 1967)

I had an experience of this sick mentality specifically after I raised my voice against some of Maulana Maududi's views.

In his own manifesto of Jama'at-e-Islami an important clause mentions that the party should not consider anyone beyond criticism. I drew nothing but praise from the circles of this party so long as I used this strategy on others. But when I criticized certain views that Maulana himself held, I became an outcast. Perhaps this clause was intended for others but not for self-criticism.

Maulana Maududi has authored a book ('خلافت و ملوكیت' Caliphate and Monarchy) in which he mentions that the system of caliphate is the ideal Islamic system. Its corrupted form is the system of monarchy. The gist of Maulana's entire effort is to reinstitute the system of caliphate in the Islamic world.

The book describes the effects of transition from caliphate to monarchy under eight categories. The fourth category is titled 'the end of freedom of expression'. The author writes:

"In Islam free expression of opinion is not simply a right; it is an obligation. The Islamic society and state would stay on the right path only if the conscience of the community was alive and its members were free to express themselves. People should be free to correct anyone regardless of status and to speak the truth. During the period of the righteous caliphs people were granted this freedom to its fullest extent. The caliphs would not only allow criticism but would also encourage people to do so as

appropriate. Those who criticized (in a constructive way) were not oppressed or threatened but were accorded due praise. They were not simply suppressed and silenced but were provided with satisfying answers.

When caliphate was replaced with monarchy, the conscience of the community was silenced and the tongues were tied. The norm of the times was either to praise the rulers or to stay quite. People were told to be prepared for imprisonment, flogging and assassination if they would not resist from standing up for truth. And so it happened that people who raised their voice were given exemplary punishment." (Caliphate and Monarchy: Dehli 1967, page 163)

According to Maulana's efforts at revival of the caliphate and his own analysis under eight categories, the fourth category clearly spells out that constructive criticism needs to be addressed appropriately, encouraged and rewarded. On the other hand, the system of monarchy suppresses criticism, threatens its opponents and persecutes those who do not step back.

Against this background of Maulana's analysis I would like to share an incident that happened to me about five or six years ago when I was still a member of the Jama'at-e-Islami. I had a few concerns and objections to some of Maulana's writings. In December 1961 I compiled my viewpoint and mailed it to Maulana. I expected that being a proponent of the revival of the system of caliphate, he would acknowledge my right to express my opinion, consider it as a proof of my living conscience, answer me in a satisfying manner and even express admiration. But this is not what took place. I have included my mutual correspondence with Maulana over two years in my book *تعبر کی غلطی*. The readers can easily understand that Maulana did not really address my concerns but adopted an attitude that he himself considered to be a characteristic of monarchy.

Why did he not provide a satisfactory explanation? I am quoting from his responses:

"Your study is imperfect and on top of that your style suggests that you consider yourself on a very high intellectual plane. My problem is that I am

used to interact with those have such an attitude despite their obvious deficiency of knowledge." Page 164

"You have gone beyond the point where any effort to make you understand would be useful." Page 65

"I can sense stubbornness and self-assertion in you, and it is doubtful if you have the capacity for self-accountability." Page 168

"You have reached such a far and high level that any communication with you is impossible and futile."

In this way Maulana Maududi continued to pass judgment on me without addressing any of my questions and when I continued to insist he wrote, 'go ahead and publish your views. The list of my detractors is fairly long and your inclusion in it would not make a difference'.

Please read Maulana's comments and decide for yourself whether he is writing in the spirit of caliphate according to his own analysis or in the spirit of monarchy. Maulana not only reserves the right for himself to criticize any Islamic revivalist without exception but also goes further by pointing out the 'mistakes' of the Companions of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him), and even holds the righteous caliphs accountable. However, he is quick enough to pass the same punitive judgment on his own detractors that he attributes to the monarchists. The only difference is that the monarchy punished its critics with flogging and imprisonment while Maulana Maududi used his pen for this purpose.

This is exactly what Maulana Abdul Majid Daryabadi described as the sick mentality. The fact is that constructive criticism is in the best interest of collective life. The only condition is that the critic criticizes on the basis of principle and justice while the one being criticized pays attention to it without any regard for personal interest and egoism.

Individual growth and societal unity take place in an environment of constructive criticism and an ability to tolerate it. Higher achievement requires neutrality and objectivity on an intellectual level, and sincerity and

tolerance on a practical level. This is the essence of the Prophetic tradition in which a difference of opinion is described as a blessing.

Being criticized is intolerable for most people but constructive criticism resulting from a healthy difference of opinion can be a great blessing if society develops the capacity to accept it.

## ERROR AND ITS NATURE

The history of Marxism can be described as the economic interpretation of history. The explanation of life and its events as given by Karl Marx is dominated by his obsession with economics. In the same way Maulana Maududi's interpretation of religion is colored entirely by his political ideology. It will be very appropriate to describe his ideology as nothing but a political interpretation of religion.

Life consists of several components that are distinct but interconnected. Not all of them carry equal weight; some are more important than others and deserve more elaborate understanding and explanation. We can explain these components in three different ways:

1. Legal approach: An aspect of life is explained in its individual capacity as it stands. It is not explained in relationship with others.
2. Rhetorical approach: One aspect of life is explained in an exaggerated way giving it undue importance at the expense of others. This is a temporary approach and is usually done at certain times for motivational and revolutionary purposes. The need of the hour justifies it.
3. Interpretational approach: All aspects of life are explained in an integrated fashion but in such a way that one aspect assumes central importance. It acts as the common link through which all other components are analyzed. Without reference to the central theme, all other components become meaningless.

In this treatise the word 'interpretation' is used as described in the third approach.

Let's apply this methodology to the issue of economics.

1. Human beings are composed of body and soul. Just like body needs economic resources to fulfill its needs, the soul also stands in need of certain things for its gratification.
2. Life depends upon economics. An individual who has no economic resources has virtually lost his life.

3. Economics is the real thing in history. Economic conditions portray the real life of a nation. It underlies all human emotions. All disciplines of knowledge and all institutions depend upon the prevalent economic conditions in a society.

Religion can be interpreted in the same fashion as well. It has various components that can be explained according to the above mentioned approaches. Jurisprudence is the legal way of interpreting religion. The missionaries and reformers often adopt the second approach. The third approach has been utilized less commonly and is not as well developed in Islamic history although mysticism (تصوف) can be offered as an example.

Maulana Maududi's missionary thought belongs to the interpretational approach. His introduction to religion is a distinct type of comprehensive interpretation where one element emerges as dominant through which everything else is explained.

I will be the first one to acknowledge that an expression, notably a technical one, cannot provide the most accurate and comprehensive description of a situation. However, if we study Maulana Maududi's writings on this subject, a distinct concept of religion emerges for which I cannot come up with a better description than the political interpretation of religion.

The political ideology has come to occupy the focal point of religion. Without political undertones the objective of prophethood cannot be determined. The system of religious belief remains incompletely understood without it. The importance of religious rituals like daily prayers cannot be determined. The stations of تقوی and احسان cannot be attained without it. The Night Journey of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon him, seems meaningless. In short, the entire religion becomes incomprehensible, or as Maulana states, it loses three fourths of its essence.

After these preliminary remarks I will discuss my view point in detail in the ensuing chapters.

## Political interpretation of religion

“The issue of earning one’s livelihood is an extremely important matter of life. Everyone must be entitled to all the opportunities and facilities for earning his or her livelihood. No one should be allowed to exploit anyone else.”

No one will disagree with the above statement. However, when this statement emerges as the main ideology of Marxism then every sensible person feels compelled to oppose it.

The one and only reason for this change of attitude is that, the economics despite being a simple reality with its unquestionable importance evolves into a complete philosophy when viewed in the light of Marxist thought. What follows as a natural consequence of this is that economics becomes the issue of life, rather than being one of its peripheral issues. Now everything is viewed and explained in its light. The relative importance of individuals and communities is determined according to economic factors. It begins to govern all sentiments and thought processes. It becomes the fulcrum of all the tension and struggle. In short, the world of thought and action revolves around economics. The other issues of life do not necessarily disappear but they lose their individual meaning and become subservient to the only reality – the economics.

The beginning of the socialist ideology in Europe owes itself to the temporary state of affairs in the social life of the masses resulting from the industrial revolution. Industrial dependence on technology affected the life of the common people and especially the workers so adversely that some compassionate thinkers started demanding reforms that would allow the workers their share of the benefits of the industrial revolution just like their capitalist employers. In other words, the basis of socialism was essentially an economic value.

It is a fact that no movement gains momentum and mass appeal until some element of exaggeration is added to it. Similarly missionary and revolutionary psychology added intensity and exaggeration to the statements of socialist thinkers and gradually led them to develop a

complete ideology revolving around economics. Marx is the dividing line between what he described as the Utopian socialism that preceded him (up to the middle of the nineteenth century) and the scientific socialism that came with him.

So long as socialism implied an emphasis on social reformation it worked fine. However, once it assumed the form of the Marxist philosophy, its transformation became its basic fault.

The same analogy applies to religion. When a religious tradition was being destroyed in a particular time period and in specific circumstances, men of faith would stand up and try to revive it. The intensity of the call to action and its interests both demand a certain degree of exaggeration. It is but natural that when a revivalist would stand up to propagate his mission he would not be content with employing only juristic and logical jargon but he would use rhetorical and proselytizing style. Instead of speaking in measured tone he would try to move the emotions of his audience with torrential flow of words.

Here I will quote an incident from the life of Saeed ibn Al-Musayyab, the famous follower of the Companions of Holy Prophet (peace be upon Him).

قال برد مولى بن المسيب لسعيد بن المسيب: ما رأيت أحسن ما يصنع هؤلاء،  
قال: سعيد وما يصنعون؟ قال: يصلّي أحدهم الظهر ثم لا يزال صافاً رجليه  
يصلّي حتى العصر. فقال سعيد: ويحك يا برد! أما والله ما هي بالعبادة، تدرّي ما  
العبادة؟ إنما العبادة التفكير في أمر الله والكف عن محارم الله.

Bard, the freed slave of Saeed ibn Al-Musayyab once mentioned to him that he had not seen anyone people better than some people who will continue to pray from Dhur to Asr. Ibn Al-Musayya b said: "Bard! By Allah this is not worship. Do you know what (real) worship is? It is to ponder over the commandments of Allah and to stay away from what He has forbidden."

(طبقات ابن سعد volume 5, page 100)

It does not imply at all that a scholar and God-fearing person of the caliber of Ibn Al-Musayyab was unaware of the components of worship such as prayers, fasting, acts of remembrance and recitation of the Holy Quran. His statement was not a juristic or logical statement. It was simply a motivational utterance. When a jurist expresses his opinion about an issue he discusses it in a legal context and explains the religious laws related to it. The missionary is not primarily concerned with the intellectual aspect and legal explanation of an issue. His main objective is reformation because of which he looks at what the people lack and how he can emphasize its importance. His priority is reformation rather than indulgence in legal discourse. He emphasizes what needs to be emphasized according to the situation and either ignores or minimizes what does not suit the intended purpose.

This style of discussion is in accordance with the Shairah and its examples can be found in the speeches of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) and the scholars and propagators of Islam in one form or the other. In fact it is not possible to perform the mission of calling people to Islam without this strategy.

So far this is an acceptable practice but the problem arises when the advocate of an ideology or his followers misunderstand his statements to be the most authentic interpretation of the Islamic creed. This is where the error takes off. For example, a writer expresses his wish before a caller to the right path to publish books about Islam in order to fulfill his responsibility of serving the religion. The caller responds, "There is nothing to be gained by publishing books. You will write the books sitting and people will read them lying down."

The above statement is being made in a particular frame of reference. But what if later generations consider this statement to be a generic fact and exclude publishing literature from the list of tasks of religious service? It would simply mean that a statement that was specific to time and circumstances became a permanent principle. In its original context it was acceptable and accurate but in its second form it became an error.

Sometimes this error progresses and from being restricted it becomes universal. The caller himself becomes so obsessed with his own thought process that what he once thought necessary to emphasize in a particular and partial sense now becomes the truth and nothing but the complete truth. He now begins to interpret the entire creed in its light. The part now becomes the whole. All the causes of good and bad in religion revolve around this one idea. Now the error has reached its furthest limit. Something that was once a component of religion (sometimes an add-on) now becomes not only the entire creed but also the actual creed. In other words, the issue of economics becomes Marxism. We now know that despite being an acceptable value of the system of life, Marxism in terms of its interpretation is a faulty ideology.

Let's consider another example to elucidate our point of view further:

A man is looking at something in three different ways. In the first instance the object is yellow in color. In the second case he either wears yellow colored glasses or he has jaundice. The first instance is a real one. So long as he is focused on that object he will see yellow. The moment he turns his attention to something else with a different color, he will no longer see yellow. In the second instance everything will appear yellow. Things will be different and will have their original shapes but their color will be nothing but yellow. Here the appearance of an external object depends upon the eye of the beholder.

The difference between missionary emphasis and interpretative methodology is like this: "A mandatory requirement for being a Muslim is for everyone claiming to be a Muslim to have a military spirit."

There is obviously an exaggeration in this statement since it is almost impossible for every Muslim to be a soldier. Not all Muslims are young and healthy males. There are children, women, old individuals, weak and sick who cannot be expected to take part in warfare. It is a rhetorical statement made with the intensity that a caller utilizes to motivate his audience and,

despite this obvious fault, it does not taint the true concept of religion nor does it imply a unique interpretation.

But let's see if someone makes a similar statement in a different way.

"Islam's true spirit lies in its militarism. The rationale behind revelation of Divine scriptures and the sending of Messengers was to instill the military spirit among the masses. The final objective of all Islamic rituals is militarization of its followers. The call to prayers (اذان) is like a military bugle that requires coming to the mosque just like the gathering of soldiers into a parade ground. Fasting is an exercise in patience to withstand the difficulties soldiers are likely to face in warfare. Pilgrimage (الحج) is marching of the Muslims in front of Allah's House. The Muslims nation is a type of God's army and Islam is a legal system that must be implemented with military might as mentioned in the following Quranic verse

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجْتُ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَنَهَايُونَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ

*You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind. You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong*

The first statement as we discussed earlier is an example of missionary zeal and enthusiasm. The second one, however, has gone to the extent of a new interpretation of religion. While the first statement lays down emphasis on military preparation the second one makes militarism the founding principle of religion through which everything else must be considered and given appropriate emphasis.

In view of our discussion so far the difference between missionary zeal and enthusiasm and an interpretative approach lies in how a person presents his view point. In one instance he emphasizes the need of a particular component of religion and in the other he makes that component the very foundation and sine qua non of religious ideology. In the first instance one component is highlighted without minimizing the importance of all components while the second approach is exclusivist. Nothing else matters without relationship with this foundational component which is now not just

one page of the book but the entire book itself. The meaning of other pages of the book cannot be determined without reference to it. A new philosophy, a new ideology has emerged as the inevitable consequence of this approach.

My main objection to Maulana Maududi's invitational literature is that he gave so much emphasis to the political aspect of religion that it turned into a comprehensive interpretation (تعییر). I do not disagree with him about discussing politics in religious not do I object to him emphasizing it since I realize that if the need arises the caller has to do it for motivational purposes. Without adopting such a strategy revolutionary proceed cannot continue. I would have had no difference with him if his approach was limited in its scope and he had not gone deeper into it till he politicized the entire concept of religion. In other words it reached the point where economic revolution turned into Marxism and military zeal led to the establishment of Khaksar Party خاکسار تحریک.

Maulana Maududi is not the only one who was imbued with a genuine desire for establishing an Islamic state in the Indian subcontinent. The idea of the revival of an Islamic state concerns every caring Muslim individual and Muslim group and everyone comes up with a strategy for its implementation according to his concept. The methodologies do differ according to circumstances but it is every Muslim's desire Islam would regain its dominance one day. انشاء الله

Where Maulana Maududi parts ways with other Islamic circles and movements is his unique interpretation. It is not his overemphasis on politics but the mentality he inculcates in his followers where everything is colored in political garb. Consider him to be like Karl Marx. Many groups strive for economic reforms but what distinguishes Marx from others is the status he assigns to economic reform and his outlook on life and universe that leads to his overall ideology.

After the fall of Dehli in 1857 the scholars of India participated in the struggle to regain political domination for Muslims and, no doubt, political involvement was given due emphasis. We can feel the intensity with which

they discussed politics at an ideological level and appreciate the efforts they engaged in at the practical end in their lives. But politics had not turned into an ideological interpretation of religion as yet; it was the expression of a necessity of their times. It did so in the writings of Maulana Maududi. First extreme emphasis was laid on politics as a vital component of religion and later it became central issue as we have discussed earlier. The relationship between the political movements of other scholars and Maulana Maududi's unique thought process is that same as that between the Utopian Socialism and the Marxist Socialism. If Maulana himself or his followers felt that he had turned an imperfect concept of Islamic state into an organized and perfect system then it will be a true statement but the reason of Maulana's error can be uncovered by a careful analysis of the same statement.

## Maulana Maududi's literature

Maulana Maududi's interpretative error does not bear any resemblance to those who deny one or more of the essential components of the Islamic creed (for example, rejection of the authority of Sunnah of the Holy Prophet peace be upon him) or to those who introduce something new such as a claim to prophethood. His main error lies in a different philosophy of religion that has occupied his mind and underlies all further errors that result from it.

If a person holds a view point that the only real purpose in life is to make money then he is not denying any other particulars and objectives of living. He will not be considered guilty of any errors of omitting or adding anything to a general concept of what life is. He will still adhere to whatever religion he practices, remain a member of his society and subscribe to a code of conduct. However the nature of his relationship to life, society and morality will change drastically. He will try to fulfill his biological needs so that he will be fit enough to make more money. He will establish friendly relationship with other people to benefit financially from them. Even his acts of philanthropy and charity will be motivated by his desire to increase his business.

The above analogy can be applied to Maulana Maududi and his error. In his mind he thought that political dominance of Islam is the mission given to Muslims by Allah and in this way the other components of religion became the means to the end. Politics became the central concept under whose light other components of religion will be interpreted and assigned relative importance. The religion evolved into a distinct mold with a political color displacing everything else from its rightful place.

We find several undeniable examples of this ideology in Maulana Maududi's literature. Here we will quote a few excerpts from Maulana's writings.

## INTERPRETATION OF LIFE AND COSMOS

*Just like Marx developed his distinct cosmological ideology under the heavy influence of economic outlook Maulana's writings also develop a predominantly political ideology of life and cosmos.*

"The component of human life that is animal and physical is governed by natural laws as designed by Allah. Like other creatures human beings are also subject to these natural laws. But where human beings part company with other creatures is their ability to distinguish between right and wrong on the basis of intellect and to act accordingly. Here they have been given a freedom of choice and action by Allah. This freedom then becomes a means of determining accountability. The rightful approach would be for human beings to obey Allah in all voluntary acts just as they are compelled to do so in the involuntary acts of biological life. In reality to Allah belongs all authority and obedience to Him is most consistent with the proper administration of this universe. Yet Allah did not force man to obey him but gave him a freedom of choice.

What human beings are required to observe in the optional component of their life is not the biological system designed by Allah but the Divine Law, the shariah, as revealed through His Messengers. The Divine Law is concerned with creed, behavior, social laws, culture, politics and state etcetra.

It is not enough to acknowledge Allah as the Creator, the Administrator of universe and its only Owner from an academic point of view but also to submit to His authority as the King, the Ruler and the Legislator from a political standpoint and to follow His code of conduct and legal injunctions.

A person may believe in Allah without assigning any partners to him but if he claims absolute authority in any voluntary act of life or claim total control on any land (as is seen in any system of monarchy and dictatorship, religious hierarchy, every citizen in a democracy or any individual who refuses to accept the Divine authority in his individual life) then he is guilty of rebellion against Allah. The same applies to an individual who submits to the authority and dictatorship of any other individual in any field of life. It is the responsibility of a true believer (مؤمن) to wipe out this act of rebellion

from the surface of the earth and to eradicate the autocracy of anyone other than Allah on Allah's land.

The mission of true believers is to establish the Divine Law in societal life just like the natural laws in other spheres of life. The only objective of their struggle is to relieve Allah's servants from the slavery of anyone else and to make them exclusive slaves of Allah. Ideally this mission should be accomplished through sincere advice, persuasion and propagation (of the correct ideology). But as is well known those who have established their unjust authority on earth and have enslaved Allah's servants, do not give up their leadership merely from sincere advice. They cannot tolerate that people should even know the truth since its spread would exterminate their control and dictatorship. The true believers are thus forced to engage in warfare to remove all the obstacles in the path of establishing God's Kingdom.

(Manifesto of Jamat-e-Islami 1948)

*(This is my translation of the passage given in Maulana Waheeduddin Khan's book. I am quoting the article 4 of Jamat-e-Islami's constitution from the web site jamaat.org.)*

#### *Article 4*

*The mission of Jama'at-e-Islami and the objective of all its efforts and struggle shall in practical terms be the establishment of the Deen (establishment of Divine Order or the Islamic way of life) and in essence the achievement of Allah's pleasure and success in the Hereafter.*

*Explanation: Jama'at views the three terms 'al-Deen', 'Divine Order', and 'Islamic Way of Life' as synonyms. The Jama'at uses the terms of 'Divine Order' or 'Islamic Way of Life' in the same sense in which the Qur'an uses the term of 'establishment of al-Deen'. The three mean the same that man must accept willingly the law-giving Order of Allah in those spheres of human life in which he has been given discretion in the same manner in which every part of the universe submits willingly or unwillingly to His physical empire. The way of life that emerges as a result of willing acceptance of Allah's law-giving Order is called 'al-Deen', 'Divine Order', or 'Islamic Way of Life'.*

*'Establishment of Deen' does not mean establishing some part of it, rather establishing it in its entirety, in individual and collective life, and whether it pertains to prayers or fasting, Haj or Zakat, socio-economic or political issues of life. No part of Islam is irrelevant, but the whole Islam is necessary. It is incumbent upon a Believer to strive for establishing Islam in its entirety without discretion and division. The part that is related to individuals' life should be observed by*

*every Believer in his own life; and all the Believers should arrange for party-discipline and joint effort for establishing that part that cannot be established without collective struggle.*

*While the Believer's real objective is to attain Allah's pleasure and success in the Hereafter, this cannot be realised without trying to establish Allah's Deen in this world. Therefore, a believer's mission in practical terms is the establishment of Deen while in essence it is the attainment of Allah's pleasure that comes as a result of the effort for establishing Deen.*

<http://jamaat.org/beta/site/page/5>

## The Vision and the Mission

*The natural consequence of the political interpretation of religion was the development of a political vision of the desired goal and generated a mission for its realization in which politics and government enjoyed a fundamental status.*

“The ultimate goal of our struggle is revolution for establishing true leadership (امامت). In other words our final destination is to establish a just system of government and leadership (امامت صالحہ کا نظام) in place of the rule of those who violate and disobey the Divine Law. We consider this struggle as a means towards attaining Allah's pleasure in this world and in the Hereafter. The importance of our objective is not known to the Muslims and non-Muslims of today. Muslims consider it a mere political objective. They have no idea of its importance in religion. The deciding factor in the reformation and subversion of human affairs lies in answering this basic question: Who controls human affairs? Without resolving this issue the demands of religion cannot be fulfilled. This highlights the importance of establishing just leadership and the true system of religion. If this is ignored then there is no way of attaining Allah's pleasure. The real objective of religion is to establish just leadership and the true system of religion as well as its maintenance. From the Islamic point of view establishment of just leadership occupies central and goal-oriented place. As far as I am concerned this is the demand of Allah's Book. This is the way of the Prophets and I cannot give up my opinion until someone proves me wrong

with evidence from Allah's Book and the practice of the Holy Prophet peace be upon him.

تحریک اسلامی کی اخلاقی بنیادین The ethical foundations of the Islamic movement.

"The mission of Jama'at-e-Islami and the objective of all its efforts and struggle shall in practical terms be the establishment of the Deen (establishment of Divine Order or the Islamic way of life) and in essence the achievement of Allah's pleasure and success in the Hereafter.

(The Mission of Jamat-e-Islami 1948)

### The meaning of Religion

*The concept of religion that emerges as a result of this particular interpretation is as follows:*

"The actual meaning of religion is very close to the current concept of state which implies acknowledgement of a higher authority by people and their submission to it. This is the meaning of religion and it requires that man submits to Allah's Supreme Authority to the exclusion of any other authority be it someone else, his own self or the entire creation. In reality Allah's Messenger has come down with a system of state from the One who sent him in which there is no room for self-authority or the authority of one human being on another. The authority and power belongs exclusively to Allah.

مسلمان اور موجودہ سیاسی کشمکش حصہ سویم (Muslims and the current political struggle volume 3)

### The Prophethood and its mission

*What was the mission of the Prophets? The answer to this question assumes a particular form in the context of Maulana Maududi's concept of religion.*

*In the chapter 'The nature of a Prophet's assignment' Maulana Maududi writes:*

"The main objective of the mission of all the Prophets has been to establish God's Kingdom on earth and thereby to establish a complete system of life that they received from God. They were willing to allow the people of ignorance the right to stay on their ignorant system of belief and to continue living their individual lives according to that but they (the Prophets) were not ready to allow them (nor could they do so naturally) the authority and power in governing human societies on the basis of the laws of the days of ignorance. Because of this all the Prophets tried to bring about political revolution. For some this was limited to prepare the ground (for worship) as in the case of Ibrahim peace be upon him. Some started a practical revolution but whose mission was terminated before establishing God's Kingdom like Essa (Jesus) peace be upon him. Some were able to accomplish it fully like Musa (Moses) and Mohammad peace be upon both of them.

*(In the footnotes Maulana Wahiduddin writes that it is not correct to attribute this view to the Prophets that they would have allowed people to stay on their ignorant creed so long as they (the Prophets) were given political power.)*

## ISLAMIC PARTY

*When Islam became a political ideology then it was inevitable that an Islamic party would become a political party.*

"People who accept the invitation (of Islam) become members of the Islamic party. In this fashion an international revolutionary party comes into being that the Holy Quran describes as حزب الله or Allah's Party. Soon after

its inception it starts a struggle (جهاد) to realize its raison d'être that mandates eradication of the authority of an unislamic system. It is given the charter of establishing a moderate and balanced system of governance that works on consensus. The Holy Quran describes this comprehensive system as كلمة الله Allah's Word.

This is not just another group of preachers and missionaries but a party of God's soldiers whose mission is to remove injustice, corruption, immorality, transgression and exploitation with force. It seeks to end the authority of anyone other than God and to replace evil with good. It has no other way to achieve this without assuming authority and power. A corrupt way of life results from a corrupt system of governance. Just and righteous way of life cannot be established until power shifts from corrupted individuals to righteous ones.

(تفهیمات حصہ اول "جهاد فی سبیل اللہ")

## PURPOSE OF WORSHIP

*The status of ritual worship in view of the political interpretation of religion is described in the following words.*

"The pillars of Islam that Allah has declared obligatory, daily prayers, fasting, pilgrimage and obligatory charity, are not like the rituals of other religion that merely consist of certain practices to pacify God. These pillars of Islam have been mandated in order to prepare you (the Muslims) for a bigger purpose and to impart practical training for a bigger task. That purpose and that task is to replace the rule of men over men with the absolute rule of one and only one God. Jihad is the relentless and undaunted struggle for achieving this purpose. Daily prayers, fasting, pilgrimage and obligatory charity are training drills for this struggle.

خطبات صفحہ 205

The purpose of congregational prayers

For a Muslims this mortal word is a battle ground for intense struggle and combat. There are many strongholds of rebels who disobey Allah and enforce their self-made laws in human life. The Muslims have been assigned this heavy responsibility to stand up against them and implement the Divine Law. This is not a task that can be accomplished by one individual. Even if millions of Muslims engage in individual efforts, they would not be able to succeed against the organized power of their opponents. Hence it is inevitable for those who want to worship only Allah to organize themselves in the form of a group for the purpose of united struggle. The system of daily prayers serves this purpose in addition to building the individual character. It provides the blue print of a collective system, maintains it and renews it five times a day so that it continues to function as a machine.

اسلامی عبادات پر تحقیقی نظر

## PIETY AND GOD CONSCIOUSNESS

تقوی اور احسان

(These two technical words are very comprehensive and it is difficult to find an exact one-word synonym in English for either. Taqwa has been translated as piety, fear, awareness of God, avoidance of crossing the boundaries set by Allah etc. Ihsan is defined in a hadith as worshipping Allah as if you are seeing him; otherwise, He sees you anyway. Other meanings are to do things in the best possible way and to be nice to others.)

“The essence of piety is fear of (displeasing) Allah that compels a person to avoid doing things that He does not approve of. The essence of God-consciousness is love for Allah that motivates man to do acts that will win His pleasure. The difference between the two can be understood through an example. Take one group of people who work for a government. They fulfill their responsibilities with a sense of duty and speediness. They observe all the rules and regulations and do not do anything that the state can find objectionable. There is another group of people who are extremely loyal to the government and who are ready to lay down their life for it if needed. They are sincere and devoted and go beyond the call of duty to

further the interests of the state. They always do more than what is required of them and will not shy away from any sacrifice for the cause of the state. They feel hurt if the law is violated anywhere. They stand up to defend the state against any rebellion. Not only they themselves avoid any act that will hurt the interest of the state but they also find it intolerable to see such acts being done by others. They would not leave any stone unturned to suppress any attempt at sabotage. It is their sincere desire to extend the rule of their government far and wide.

The first of these two groups can be described as pious (متقى) and the other as God-conscious (محسن). The pious do get promotion and are regarded as excellent employees but the rewards of the God-conscious are of a higher category. They pious people in the Islam (Islamic state) are admirable and trustworthy but the real power of Islam (Islamic state) lies with the group of the God-conscious. What Islam actually demands can be achieved only through them.

تحریک اسلام کی اخلاقی بنیادیں "احسان"

## TESTIMONY FOR THE TRUTH

*The task of standing up as witnesses to the truth and to provide conclusive argument for it has become inseparable from establishment of a system of governance in the framework of Maulana Maududi's interpretation of religion. This cannot be accomplished without establishing (an Islamic) government.*

"The testimony (to the truth of Islamic ideology) can only be fulfilled to its desired effect through the establishment of a state on these principles. The state will then act according to the comprehensive ideology of the Islamic creed and promote justice and equality, reform, organized administration, total welfare for all of its citizens, noble character for its rulers, reformed internal policy, unbiased external policy, just war and loyalty.

Such an ideal state will be the real testimony that the religion behind its establishment is the only one that can guarantee human salvation and that the welfare of the human race depends upon following it.

The responsibility (given to the Muslims) is fulfilled when this practical testimony combines with verbal testimony and this is the (meaning of) conclusive argument (of Islam) against mankind.

شهادت حق

## THE EVENT OF THE PROPHET'S HEAVENLY ASCENT

*Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon him, was accompanied by the Angel Gabriel, peace be upon him, to Jerusalem and from there to the highest Heaven to meet with Allah. This incident took place in Mecca a few years before the Prophetic migration to Medina where an Islamic state was established. Translator)*

*Maulana Maududi goes to the extent of introducing historical events in political language as a consequence of his political interpretation of the Islamic creed.*

“The planet earth is a small part of Allah’s majestic universe. It is like one of the provinces of a vast empire in which Messengers are sent by Allah just like governments sent their governors and viceroys to the lands under their control. But there is a big difference between the two as well. It had been twelve years since Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon him, started preaching his mission. Now the Islamic movement was to go on to its next level by which I mean migrating from the unsuitable conditions in Mecca to Medina where the ground was ready for his success and where the movement would transform into an Islamic state. For this reason Allah called him to confer a new letter of appointment and a new set of instructions. This call before the King is the heavenly ascent ”**معراج**”

“The fourteen point agenda given to Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon him, (on meeting with Allah) was not simply a code of ethics but a manifesto of Islam through which he was required to establish a society in the times to come. These instructions were given at a critical junction where the missionary movement was about to pass to the next phase of political authority. Hence, at the very outset of this phase God’s Messenger, peace be upon him, was given the principles on the basis of which he would establish a new civilization. Five daily prayers were made obligatory at that time along with the fourteen-point agenda to instill a

sense of moral unity among people who would stand up to implement it, and so that they would not remain unaware of (their responsibility to) God at any time.”

معراج کی رات

This is the end of quotations from Maulana Maududi's writings.

Maulana Wahiduddin then writes:

If we quote more excerpts (from Maulanad Mawdudi's writings) then these would be as long as the relevant literature of the architect of (the political) interpretation (of religion). What we have quoted should be sufficient to understand the nature of the issue under discussion. Anyone can see clearly every component of religion has assumed a political color that dominates the ideals of life and universe the same way that Marx's interpretation is colored by economics. The entire agenda has been politicized. Religion has become a political framework. The prophetic mission becomes a predominantly political one. The community of Muslims becomes a political party at its best. Even the rituals of worship become subordinates of the political mission. The ideals of piety and God-consciousness (تقوى اور احسان) are explained in political terms. Testimony to truth (شهادت حق) is now a political testimony. The Heavenly Ascent is a political journey. In short, the entire religion is now a collection of distinct ideas that cannot be understood without political reference. Can this be described as an emphasis on political aspect of religion? No, this is an interpretation for which I do not find a more appropriate term than a political interpretation of religion.

## ARGUMENTS FROM THE QURAN AND THE PROPHETIC TRADITIONS

Someone might raise a question that what's wrong with Maulana Maududi dealing with politics as the central component of religion? May be this is the actual place of politics in religion. But what is the proof of such a contention? Mere claims and writings of a scholar are enough to prove that politics is the central tenet of religion. Proof is needed from the Holy Quran and the Prophetic traditions (حدیث), a direct proof from the actual text of these two divine sources. Any other attempt at proving it would only weaken this claim.

Maulana Maududi and other writers belonging to his school of thought have tried to prove their point through the Quranic verses and the Prophetic traditions that I have analyzed in detail in my book تعبیر کی غلطی. As can be seen in that book none of these references support Maulana Maududi's interpretation of religion.

Here I will present one Quranic verse and one Prophetic tradition that have been quoted by Maulana Maududi.

Among the various Quranic verses used as a reference the following one deserves special mention.

شَرَعَ لِكُمْ مِّنَ الدِّينِ مَا وَصَّى بِهِ نُوحًا وَاللَّذِي أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكُمْ وَمَا وَصَّيْنَا بِهِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَمُوسَى وَعِيسَى أَنْ أَقِيمُوا الدِّينَ وَلَا تَتَفَرَّقُوا فِيهِ

الشورى 13

God has ordained for you the same religion which He enjoined on Noah, and which We have revealed to you, and which We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus, so that you should remain steadfast in religion and not become divided in it.

The word الدين or religion is interpreted as all the commandments and laws of the Islamic legislation that are related to individual, collective, national and international affairs. The word اقيموا is explained as the commandment to establish those laws.

As far as I know no commentator of the Holy Quran worth mentioning has explained this verse the way Maulana Maududi has done. All other commentators explain religion mentioned in this verse as the basic religion or the basic teachings of the Islamic creed and not the entire religion. The establishment of religion is to fulfill in an individual capacity those basic requirements of religion that everyone is obligated to do under all circumstances, and not imposing the system of Islamic jurisprudence (شرعی نظم) on others. In other words, it implies fulfilling those basic requirements that qualify an individual as a Muslim.

In Maulana Maududi's circle of influence 'establish the religion' assumes the implication of imposing it on others in the minds that have been preprogrammed by the founder of this specific thought process. In other words it is understood as 'establish God's Kingdom'.

Various Urdu translators of the meanings of the Holy Quran, including Shah Abdul Qadir, Shah Rafiuddin, Abdul Haq Haqqani, Ashraf Ali Thanvi, Deputy Nazir Ahmed and Shaikh Mahmood-ul-Hassan have translated it as 'stay on this religion' of 'establish this religion' as I have explained.

The basis of our opinion stems from the actual words of this verse. Allah is commanding to establish a religion that was given to all the Prophets from Noah, peace be upon him to the last Messenger Mohammad, peace be upon him. The religious teachings revealed to various prophets through history were not exactly the same. The basic tenets of religion were the same but the detailed legislation and practical laws were different. Hence the commandment can only relate to the aspects of religion common to all the prophets, peace be upon all of them.

Imam Razi writes:

أنه عطف عليه سائر الأنبياء وذلك يدل على أن المراد هو الأخذ بالشريعة المتفق

عليها بين الكل

This is inclusive of all the Prophets, peace be upon all of them, and it argues that the intended meaning (of this part of the verse) is that part of the Divine Writ that is common to all of them.

The following is Imam Razi's explanation of this verse.

وأقول يجب أن يكون المراد من هذا الدين شيئاً مغايراً للتكاليف والأحكام ،  
وذلك لأنها مختلفة متفاوتة قال تعالى : { لِكُلٍّ جَعَلْنَا مِنْكُمْ شِرْعَةً وَمِنْهَا جَا } [ ]  
المائدة : 48 ] فيجب أن يكون المراد منه الأمور التي لا تختلف باختلاف  
الشرائع ، وهي الإيمان بالله وملائكته وكتبه ورسله واليوم الآخر ، والإيمان يوجب  
الإعراض عن الدنيا والإقبال على الآخرة والسعى في مكارم الأخلاق والاحتراف  
عن رذائل الأحوال

And I say that necessarily the intended meaning of 'this religion' is something other than those responsibilities and commandments that are different (among various Prophets, peace be upon all of them) as Allah has said: 'To every one of you We have ordained a law and a way.'

Then necessarily it implies those issues that are not affected by a difference in legislation. These are belief in Allah, all angels, all Divine scriptures, all Prophets and the Day of Judgment. Belief leads to other things including turning away from this world and focusing on the Hereafter, an effort to develop the best character and avoidance of bad manners.

Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi writes:

"The religion means the principles of religion that are common to all legislations (شرائع) such as Unity of God, Prophethood, Resurrection and other essential components of the belief system. And 'establish it' means 'don't change it'.

Almost all the commentators of the Holy Quran have expressed similar opinion. Some have mentioned only the common things of the belief system while others have also mentioned the actions that result from it.

I will quote from some commentators.

ابوالعالية  
الاخلاص لله و عبادته

Sincerity (of worship) towards Allah and worshipping Him (exclusively)

مجاهد

لم يبعث نبي إلا أمر بإقامة الصلاة وإيتاء الزكاة والإقرار بالله تعالى وطاعته سبحانه  
وذلك إقامة الدين تفسير روح المعانى

No Prophet, peace be upon him, was sent except that Allah ordered him to establish prayers, pay the obligatory charity, confirm his belief in Allah and obey Him, and this is what is meant by establishing the religion.

وهو ما شرع لهم من العقائد المتفق عليها ، من توحيد الله وطاعته ، والإيمان  
برسله وبكتبه وبالاليوم الآخر ، والجزاء فيه . تفسير البحر الحيط لابو حيyan

This refers to the common system of belief such as the Divine Unity, obedience to Allah, belief in His Messengers, Scriptures and the Day of Judgment with the accountability of actions in it.

والمراد بإقامة الدين هو توحيد الله والإيمان به وبكتبه ورسله واليوم الآخر وطاعة  
الله في أوامره ونواهيه وسائر ما يكون الرجل به مسلماً ، ولم يرد الشرائع التي هي  
مصالح الأمم على حسب أحواها فإنها مختلفة متفاوتة قال الله تعالى : { لكل  
جعلنا منكم شرعة ومنهاجاً } تفسير الخازن

Here establishing the religion means Divine Unity, belief in the Scriptures, Messenger and the Day of Judgment, and obedience to Allah in what He commands and prohibits, and doing what makes a person a Muslim. Here the legislative aspects of religion are not implied that can vary according to the need of the times for public interest as Allah has said that We have enjoined every one of you a law and a way.

أي دين الإسلام الذي هو توحيد الله تعالى وطاعته والإيمان بكتبه ورسله وباليوم  
الجزاء وسائر ما يكون العبد به مؤمنا ، والمراد بإقامته تعديل أركانه وحفظه من أن  
يقع فيه زيف والمواظبة عليه تفسير روح المعانى

(Establishing the religion) that is the religion of Islam that consists of the Divine Unity, obedience to Allah , belief in His Scriptures, His Messengers, the Day of Judgment and all actions that make a person a believer. And the meaning of establishing it is to perform correctly all the necessary requirements of religion, to be watchful of (one's duty to) it to avoid falling into deviation and continuity of doing so.

يعني اقامة اصوله من التوحيد و النبوة و المعاد و نحو ذلك دون الفرع التي تختلف بحسب الاوقات بقوله: { لَكُلِّ جَعْلٍ نَّا مِنْكُمْ شَرِيعَةٌ وَمِنْهَاجٌ } غرائب القرآن قمي نيسابوري

That is upholding its basic principles such as the Divine Unity, Prophethood, Resurrection and likewise with the exception of the peripheral things that vary according to the situation as Allah has said: To every one of you we enjoined a law and a way.

"أَنْ أَقِيمُوا الدِّين" وَهُوَ تَوْحِيدُ اللَّهِ وَطَاعَتُهُ، وَالإِيمَانُ بِرَسُولِهِ وَكِتَبِهِ وَيَوْمِ الْجَزَاءِ،  
وَبِسَائِرِ مَا يَكُونُ الرَّجُلُ بِإِقَامَتِهِ مُسْلِمًا.

ولم يرد الشرائع التي هي مصالح الامم على حسب أحواها، فإنها مختلفة متفاوتة،  
تفسير القرطبي

"Establish the religion" means (affirmation of) the Divine Unity, obedience to Allah, belief in His Messengers (peace be upon them all), Scriptures and the Day of Judgment and performance of all actions that make a person a believer. It does not imply the legislation in public interest that can vary according to the situation.

اى قدر المشترك بينهم هو عبادة الله وحده لا شريك له و ان اختلفت شرائعهم  
ابن كثير

That is the common values among them (Prophets, peace be upon them) such specifically worshipping Allah alone even though they have different legislations.

أي شرع لكم من الدين دين نوح و محمد ومن بينهما من الأنبياء عليهم السلام ،  
ثم فسر المشروع الذي اشترك هؤلاء الأعلام من رسليه فيه بقوله { أَنْ أَقِيمُوا  
الدين } والمراد إقامة دين الإسلام الذي هو توحيد الله وطاعته والإيمان برسله  
وكتبه وبيوم الجزاء وسائر ما يكون المرء بإقامته مسلماً ، ولم يرد به الشرائع فإنا  
مختلفة قال الله تعالى : { لِكُلِّ جَعَلْنَا مِنْكُمْ شِرْعَةً وَمِنْهَا جَا } [ المائدة : 48 ]

### تفسير مدارك التنزيل

That is He legislated for you with respect to the religion the religion of Noah and Mohammad, peace be upon them, and all the other Prophets, peace be upon them, all. Then He explained what was common among the mentioned Prophets, peace be upon all of them, by stating, ‘that you all establish the religion’. Establishment of the religion means confirmation of the Divine Unity and obedience to Him, belief in His Prophets, peace be upon all of them, His Scriptures and the Day of Judgment, and all the acts whose performance makes one a Muslim. The legislations are not implied here because they vary as Allah has said, ‘For every one of you We have enjoined a law and a way.’

These excerpts from various books of Quranic exegesis clarify that the commentators interpret الدين in this verse as adoption of the basic teachings of religion in view of the specific wording. How can it then be interpreted as implementation of all individual and collective commandments of religion in every sphere of life or in other words establishment of God’s Kingdom?

What we have written in the above passages about the correct interpretation of ‘establishment of religion’ does not mean that the social laws are not our subject with respect to it. All that we want to prove is that the establishment of religion has not been obligated upon us the way Maulana Mawdudi has interpreted it. His interpretation does not find

support from other verses in the Holy Quran where the implementation of social laws is directly mentioned such as:

يَا دَاوُدُ إِنّا جَعَلْنَاكَ خَلِيقَةً فِي الْأَرْضِ فَاحْكُمْ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ بِالْحَقِّ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ هُوَيْ (ص 26)

We said, ‘David, We have given you mastery over the land. Judge fairly between people. Do not follow your desires.

On the hand this interpretation appears to arise from other verses that are not directly connected with the real issue. For example, if a person is opposed to individual ownership of land and wants to prove the concept of collective ownership, he would not find evidence in those Quranic verses where social laws are mentioned. Instead he will argue on the basis of ﷺ (the land belongs to Allah) since he can easily adopt these two words to prove his point even though this phrase has nothing to do with ownership of land or factories. All non-Quranic ideologies stem from unrelated verses.

Now let's consider Maulana Mawdudi's evidence from the Prophetic traditions. An essay was published in one of the publications released by the Jama'at-e-Islami Hind. It states ‘the manifesto that the Jama'at-e-Islami has adopted has nothing to do with the likes and dislikes of any of its members. It believes that Allah sent all the Messengers and the last Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon all of them) with the same manifesto and the same mission. Now this has become the mission of the community of Mohammad (peace be upon him). In this way the mission of Jama'at-e-Islamic gets connected directly with the real objective of the prophethood of Prophet Mohammad peace be upon him.’

The writer of this essay defined this mission in the following words:

Establishment of a Divinely guided government

Implementation of the Divine religion and legislation and reformation of world.

Establishment of the correct religion and to make it dominant over false religions.

The writer of this article considers these concepts to be the main objective of the prophethood of Prophet Mohammad peace be upon him. He finds this objective in the Holy Quran, the prophetic traditions and Islamic history. Among the many pieces of evidence that he seems to suggest, he mentions only one prophetic tradition that according to him proves his claim and is the best explanation of other relevant texts.

This narration is reported by Imam Al-Bukhari as well as other books of prophetic traditions.

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ سِنَانٍ حَدَّثَنَا هِلَالٌ عَنْ عَطَاءِ بْنِ يَسَارٍ قَالَ لَقِيْتُ  
 عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ عَمْرٍو بْنَ الْعَاصِ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا قُلْتُ أَخْبِرْنِي عَنْ صِفَةِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ  
 صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِي التَّوْرَاةِ قَالَ أَجَلْ وَاللَّهِ إِنَّهُ لَمَوْصُوفٌ فِي التَّوْرَاةِ بِعَضِ  
 صِفَتِهِ فِي الْقُرْآنِ  
 { يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ إِنَّا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ شَاهِدًا وَمُبَشِّرًا وَنَذِيرًا }  
 وَحْرَزًا لِلْأَمْمِينَ أَنْتَ عَبْدِي وَرَسُولِي سَمَيْتُكَ الْمَتَوَكِّلَ لَيْسَ بِفَظٍّ وَلَا غَلِيلٌ وَلَا  
 سَحَابٌ فِي الْأَسْوَاقِ وَلَا يَدْفَعُ بِالسَّيِّئَةِ السَّيِّئَةَ وَلَكِنْ يَعْفُو وَيَغْفِرُ وَلَكِنْ يَقْبِضُهُ اللَّهُ  
 حَتَّى يُقِيمَ بِهِ الْمِلَةَ الْعَوْجَاءَ بِإِنْ يَقُولُوا لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَيَفْتَحُ بِهَا أَعْيُنًا عُمْيًا وَآذَانًا  
 صُمًّا وَقُلُوبًا غُلْفًا

Narrated by Ata bin Yasar

I met Abdullah bin 'Amr bin Al-'As (*radiallaahu 'anhu*) and asked him, "Tell me about the description of Allah's Apostle (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wasallam*) which is mentioned in Torah (i.e. Old Testament.)" He replied, 'Yes. By Allah, he is described in Torah with some of the qualities attributed to him in the Quran as follows: "O Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wasallam*)! We have sent you as a witness (for Allah's True religion), and a giver of glad tidings (to the faithful believers), And a warner (to the unbelievers), and guardian of the illiterates. You are My slave and My messenger (i.e. Apostle). I have named you "Al-Mutawakkil" (who depends upon Allah). You are neither discourteous, harsh, nor a noise-maker in the markets. And you do not do evil to those who do evil to you, but you deal with them with forgiveness and kindness. Allah will not let him (the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wasallam*)) die till he makes straight the crooked people by making them say: "None has the right to be worshiped but Allah," with which will be opened blind eyes and deaf ears and enveloped hearts."

The writer concludes in his comments upon this narration that “the purpose of the prophethood of Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon him, was establishment of religion. Hundreds of years before his prophethood Torah had predicted that he, peace be upon him, would not die until the religion was established”.

The article concludes with the following statement:

“This detailed discussion adds to our assertion that Jama’at-e-Islami has not committed any error in adopting its mission since this is the mission of the entire Muslim nation but it is not paying due attention to it.”

زندگی اپریل 1962

The writer translates crooked people as ‘distorted religion’ even though the following phrase ‘by making them say’ implies a group since the statement is made by people and not by religion.

The narration refers to a special plan that Allah had made for his Last Prophet, peace be upon him, to fight his first opponents (the pagans of Quraish) and force them to change their faith as a result of which many non-religious people were guided to the religion of Islam. I will quote the explanation of this narration given by two most prominent commentators of the Sahih Al-Bukhari.

قوله حتى يقيم به أي حتى ينقى به الشرك ويثبت التوحيد قوله الملة العوجاء هي  
ملة العرب ووصفها بالعوج لما دخل فيها من عبادة الأصنام وتغييرهم ملة إبراهيم  
عليه الصلاة والسلام عن استقامتها وإماليتهم بعد قوامها والمراد من إقامتها  
إخراجها من الكفر إلى الإيمان عمدة القاري بدرالدين عيني

The meaning of ‘establishing with him’ is that Allah will negate association with any partners with him, and confirmation of Divine Unity through His Prophet, peace be upon him. The ‘crooked people’ refers to the Arab community (of that time). The Arabs of that time were so described because they had distorted the religion of their forefather Prophet Ibrahim, peace be upon him, and they had resorted to worshipping idols. The

'establishment of religion' with respect to these Arabs is to bring them from disbelief to (true Islamic) belief.

وَقُولُه " حَتَّىٰ يُقِيمَ بِهِ الْمِلَةُ الْعَوْجَاءُ " أَيْ مِلَةُ الْعَرَبِ ، وَوَصَفَهَا بِالْعَوْجِ لِمَا دَخَلَ فِيهَا مِنْ عِبَادَةِ الْأَصْنَامِ ، وَالْمُرَادُ بِإِقَامَتِهَا أَنْ يَخْرُجَ أَهْلُهَا مِنَ الْكُفُرِ إِلَى الإِيمَانِ

فتح الباري حافظ ابن حجر

His statement 'correcting the crooked people by him, peace be upon him' refers to the Arab community (of that time). The Arabs of that time were described as crooked due to the propagation of idol worshipping among them, and their correction means taking them out of disbelief and entering them into (the true Islamic) belief.

The explanation provided above from two well-known commentaries on Sahi Al-Bukhari clarifies that the hadith cannot be used as an evidence for the purpose that the writer of the article referred to above has used it. Firstly the action that this tradition mentions is to say 'there is no god but Allah' and we cannot understand the basis for interpreting it as reformation of the world and the establishment of a Divinely guided government.

Secondly the text of the narration does not describe it as an obligation of the Muslim nation but an act of Allah that He will implement through His Prophet, peace be upon him.

Thirdly the narration mentions that Allah will not let him (the Prophet (sallallaahu `alayhi wasallam)) die till he makes straight the crooked people by making them say: "None has the right to be worshiped but Allah." It is quite clear that the reference here is to a specific event in which the preacher will not die until people state the Islamic testimony of Divine Unity.

Now if we interpret it to mean this becomes the responsibility of all the Muslims since they are deputies of the Holy Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon him, then every Muslims should take a pledge that he will not die until he makes the people he addresses Muslims. Is the writer himself ready to make such a pledge?

Our point of view should not be misinterpreted. We are not saying that world reformation and establishment of a Divinely guided government have nothing to do with Islam. What we believe is that the laws governing individual life and those related to the collective life in the society are not the same. Maulana Maududi's political interpretation puts both sets of laws at the same level and this is what cannot be substantiated from the Holy Quran and the Prophetic traditions.

Obligatory individual laws apply to every person (such as five daily prayers, fasting); voluntary actions are to be performed when a person is able to do so. Collective laws are of a different character. Their implementation requires the participation of the entire society. This is the reason for gradual revelation of such laws when the believers were able to organize themselves politically and they were in a position to implement them in the society even if it required the use of force. It is the Muslim sovereign society to which the collective laws of Islamic legislation are addressed and not the scattered Muslim groups and individuals.

When we study the history of the Israelites we find that legislation was not prescribed so long as they were in Egypt as slaves. Once they achieved the status of a free and sovereign group, Allah sent down the Mosaic Laws. The Meccan situation was very similar to the initial condition of the Isarelites. The Quranic legislation revealed initially demanded its implementation from every believer and is mandatory for every believer to practice everywhere and under all situations. The rest of the legislation came down gradually according to the changing situation of the early Muslims. The laws related to establishment of an Islamic state were revealed once the first community of believers achieved sovereignty.

The chronology of Quranic laws demonstrates that under usual circumstances the believers are obligated to perform only what was revealed prior to the establishment of an Islamic state. The rest of the revealed legislation becomes binding when the believers have the power and the resources to fulfill it as required. The widening circle of Islamic laws according to the changing conditions shows that all the Quranic laws are not obligated under all circumstances but apply under specific situation. The determination of what applies when and where depends upon the current condition of the group who is addressed. The fact of the matter is that the principal addressee of cultural and collective laws is only that group of believers who is in a position to implement them. People with limited

autonomy are not obligated to establish the religious laws at the societal and national level. Observing any law is a practical demand that can be made only from people who have submitted to it and the demand to practice is proportionate to their capacity.

The Islamic legislation is very clear on this issue as can be seen from the following Quranic verse:

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

Allah does not burden a soul beyond its capacity.

It is not Allah's way to overburden any individual. How can then one say that the believers would be given a command that they could not fulfill? If someone gives a detailed list of religious laws and claims that all the believers under every condition are under an obligation to enforce all of them everywhere, then it is like asking every Muslim to struggle towards having all financial assets that come under the jurisdiction of Zakat (زكوة) so that he can pay zakat on all of these as stated in Islamic jurisprudence.

Hence it follows that the detailed religious laws are not absolute but apply according to circumstances. As the circle and influence of the believers expands the demands of religious law grow. If a believer is living alone he is obligated to do what relates to his own self only. When a group of believers grow into one or more families then some form of collective law will apply. When an Islamic sovereign society is established then the entire society has a responsibility to implement the Divine laws pertaining to it. This would necessitate the appointment of a political leader under whose supervision the society would act according to the Islamic legislation. The issue of authority of leadership relates to the last situation which is mandatory by the consensus of Muslim scholars.

## WHERE DOES THE WRONG INTERPRETATION LEAD TO?

After the publication of my book many rebuttals and criticisms were published from the platform of the Jama'at-e-Islami in both India and Pakistan. All that it achieved was to illustrate this reality further that the Jama'at did not have any real evidence in support of its political interpretation of religion.

I will quote one excerpt from the published works against my book that will give the readers an idea of how irrelevant and unreal these writings are from the point of view of my real objection to Maulana Maududi's interpretation.

One author writes the following in response to my objection to Maulana Maududi's inference from the verse **لیظہرہ علی دین کلہ**.

"Some people are of the opinion that we cannot fulfill our obligation of establishing the religion until we establish caliphate along the lines of Prophet conduct or a functional Islamic state, and since we cannot do so here we are not to be considered obligated to it. But to think so would be a consequence of ignoring an established principle of religion. That established principle is that Allah has made every individual responsible to strive towards fulfilling every commandment. If the individual tried his best then he has fulfilled his responsibility. Therefore those who have this opinion should correct themselves."

The author then quotes several examples from religious texts and puts forward intellectual arguments towards his conclusion. "After all why should establishment of religion be considered the only obligation that, if not fulfilled practically, would not absolve us of our responsibility? If this way of thinking becomes an excuse for a person to avoid struggle for the sake of performing this responsibility then will it be an excuse for him in front of Allah?"

اشارات زندگی اکتوبر 1965

This rebuttal appears to be quite strong but the question is what exactly is the writer trying to respond to? I don't know anyone who would have raised such a senseless objection and, as far as I am concerned, I have never written that establishment of an Islamic government is not the correct

interpretation of the religious mission since it would imply that Muslims must establish an Islamic government rather than simply try to do so. What I have written is in connection with the verse لیظہرہ علی دین کله since this verse does not mention mere effort as is the case with all other Islamic commandments but it is predicting an event that would necessarily take place ‘no matter how much the disbelievers and the polytheists dislike’. Hence if we interpret this verse as implying establishment of an Islamic state as the real mission (for all the Muslims) then it cannot mean mere effort but actual establishment of such a state.

This is not the place for me to repeat the academic discussion on Quranic verses and Prophetic traditions that I have presented in my book. Those interested in further research can read the relevant part of the book. Here I will just refer to the conclusion produced as a necessary result of Maulana Maududi’s interpretation of religion, and that is a change in how we view the Islamic history in its light.

A distinct example of this change can be found in two very important books written by Maulana Maududi, ‘Four Basic Quranic Terms’ and ‘Revival and Reformation of Religion’.

First the first book deals with four basic Quranic terms (الله, رب, عبادة, دین). In the introduction Maulana Maududi complains that the dictionaries of the later centuries gave limited and vague meaning of many Quranic words. For example, الله was translated as ‘the one who is worshipped’ (معبد) and رب was considered synonymous with ‘the one who nurtures’. The term عبادة was interpreted as ‘worship’ and دین was understood as ‘religion’. In this way every word was specified for a special type of spiritual and religious concept while obscuring its cultural and political reference, according to Maulana Maududi. Hence, Maulana has tried to uncover the cultural and political meaning of these four basic Quranic terms.  
(For details refer to تعبیر کی غلطی Chapter 4)

How did such a major error come about in the interpretation of these important Quranic terms and how did it become so prevalent in the entire Islamic world over several centuries is explained in simple words by Maulana Maududi, according to his theory, as ‘the earlier people did not understand the Islamic creed (دین) correctly’. In this way the specific thought (of Maulana Maududi) under discussion was able to satisfy itself. However, it went on to change the nature of Islamic history. Muslims have believed

that there is continuity, at least at an ideological level, in Islamic history. Now this belief received a setback. It began to appear that the Islamic history had suffered from a big vacuum (in understanding) in its long period and no one before Maulana Maududi had tried to bridge it.

In the introduction to the four basic Quranic terms, Maulana writes:

*"When the Qur'an was first presented to the Arabs they all knew what was meant by *ilah* or *rabb* as both the words were already current in their language. They were not new terms, nor were any new meanings put upon them. They knew fully well what the connotations were and so, when it was said that Allah alone is the *Ilah*, and the *Rabb* and that no-one has the least share in the qualities and attributes which the words denote, they at once comprehended the full import, understood completely without any doubt or uncertainty as to what specifically was being declared to Pertain to Allah exclusively and what was being hence denied to others. Those who opposed the precept were very clear in their minds as to the implications of denying others than Allah to be *ilahs* or *rabb*s, in any sense, while those who accepted it knew equally well what they would have to give up by their acceptance and what they would forgo."*

*Similarly, the words 'ibadah and deen were in common use, and the people knew what was meant by 'abd, what state was implied by 'uboodiyah (the state of being an'abd) what kind of conduct was referred to when the word 'ibadah was used, and what was the sense of the term deen. So, when they were told to give up the 'ibadah of all others and reserve it exclusively for Allah, and give up all other deens and enter into the Deen of Allah only, they felt no difficulty in concluding what the Qur'anic d'awah(message) implied and the drastic revolution in their way of life it sought to bring about.*

*But as centuries passed, the real meanings of these terms gradually underwent subtle changes so that, in course of time, instead of the full connotations, they came to stand for only very limited meanings or restricted and rather vague concepts. One reason was the gradual decline of interest in the Arabic language and the other that the words ceased to have the same meanings for the later generations of Muslims that they had for the original Arabs to whom the Qur'an had been revealed. It is for these two reasons that in the more recent lexicons and commentaries many of the Qur'anic words began to be explained not by their original sense but by what they had by then come to stand for, e.g., The word *ilah*, as used in respect of others than God, came to be synonymous with idols or gods; The word *rabb* came to mean only someone who brings up or rears or feeds another or provides for his worldly needs;*

*'Ibadah began to be understood as the performance of a set of rituals of "worship";*

*Deen began to mean a religion, or belief in some precepts; and*

*The word Taghoot began to be translated to mean an idol or the Devil.*

*The result obviously was that it became difficult for people to get at the real message of the Qur'an.*

*This being the case, is it any wonder that, through the mist that has come to surround the precise sense of the four terms in question, more than three-fourths of the teachings of the*

*Qur'an, or rather, the real spirit thereof, have become obscured, and this is the main cause of the shortcomings that are to be seen in peoples' beliefs and acts despite the fact that they have not formally given up the faith of Islam but are still in its fold. It is therefore of utmost importance that in order to have a full and complete understanding of the Qur'anic teachings and of their central idea, one should know, as a fundamental to being a good Muslim, what these terms really mean.*

(Taken from an online translation of the book.  
[http://www.witnesspioneer.net/vil/Books/M\\_four\\_term/index.html#Preface](http://www.witnesspioneer.net/vil/Books/M_four_term/index.html#Preface))

The 'hidden' meaning of these four basic Quranic terms that Maulana has uncovered is all of a political nature. (The non-political meanings of these terms were already known.) In the light of the introduction quoted above what it means is that the political ideology is the basic theme of the Holy Quran and it constitutes more than three-fourths of its teachings. In fact, the political teachings are the real spirit of the Holy Quran, its central theme and its real demand. If the matter was limited to this then Maulana has been very generous in blaming later generations of their unawareness of the real Quranic teaching. He could have taken it very far!

Once the real demand of the Holy Quran became hidden from ideological and academic point of view then a necessary corollary of this was its effect on the practical efforts of the scholars and reformers of Islam. Hadith mentions that Allah would produce a revivalist in every century. According to this at least a dozen revivalists should have emerged in the Islamic world but if we look at the last fourteen centuries we do not find single person who could be called a revivalist with reference to the political ideology of Islam. Maulana Maududi has simplified this problem as well by describing the revivalists as complete and partial. According to him all the revivalists that have emerged in the Islamic history so far have been partial. The world still awaits a complete revivalist مجدد کامل. The title page of Maulana's book Revival and reformation of Islam used to be 'a critical look at the achievements of the revivalists of the nation'. This has been deleted and now all the revivalists are designated as partial.

*(This book has been translated as 'A short history of the revivalist movements in Islam'. Its third chapter as titled 'some great Mujaddids of Islam and their achievements').*

The matter does not end here but goes even further. Maulana Maududi writes, 'practically a revivalist has to do a task of the same nature as a Prophet' تجدید احیاء دین ( page 29). He goes on to say that the basic difference between a revivalist and a Prophet is that the latter gets revelation and, therefore, does not have the same status. Now if we were to accept this

political and revolutionary explanation of the Islamic creed, then we would have to accept that, just like the revivalists of the Muslim nation, the Prophets would also be partial and complete (we seek forgiveness from Allah) since the majority of Prophets were not able to bring about a political revolution in their communities. Despite the difference of status, most of the Prophets did what the partial revivalists did. To quote Maulana, ‘the struggle of some Prophets was limited to simply preparing the groundwork, like Prophet Ibrahim, peace be upon him. There were those who started a revolutionary movement but their job ended before the establishment of a Divine Kingdom like Prophet Essa (Jesus), peace be upon him. Some were successful in accomplishing their mission such as Prophet Musa (Moses) and Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon both of them.’ ( تجدید احیاء دین page 22)

Thus, according to this explanation, Prophet Ibrahim, peace be upon him, would be a partial Prophet since he was not able to take the Islamic revolutionary movement to its destination.

What problems a slight deviation from the truth can create in religious ideology!

We are being careful in making the above statement since Maulana’s own idea of government and politics, and the revolutionary concept of a perfect revivalist of the future as presented in his book would suggest that even Prophet Musa (Moses) and Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon both of them were not able to establish such a system at least in their own lifetime.

If the angle of view changes a picture appears different. If one looks at the Indian history through the glasses of Mao Tse Tung’s philosophy then even Mahatama Gandhi would be deemed an agent of bourgeoisie even though he appears as a hero of his nation in the purely Indian context. Similarly our history would appear to be suffering from a big vacuum in the context of Maulana Maududi’s political interpretation of the Islamic creed. There would seem to be no real and complete concept of religion in it nor would we find a person who could have fulfilled the desired religious responsibility. Do we need another evidence to refute this misleading interpretation? An ideology which if accepted as valid would negate the entire Islamic history is more deserving of being rejected rather than the history itself.

## CONCLUSION

At the end of this discussion it would be appropriate to explain a few things.

1. It is not my aim to attack anyone's intention nor do I want to engage into a discussion about his belief and actions. Some people have done so in the past but, with due respect to them, I would state that their example is that of a person who engages in a struggle against some deviated groups of a particular type for a long time. As a result of it he develops some fixed categories of deviation to which he assigns these groups. Whenever he comes across a group that propounds an ideology that does not appear to conform to mainstream Islam, he goes through his own list of categories and assigns that group to one of these. This is like profiling people according to fixed and predetermined categories. Each group then carries the stamp of one of the categories of deviant sects. Naturally it is not necessary that the list of human errors and shortcomings be as long as the categories established by a scholar.

*(I feel that in order to analyze Maulana Maududi's judgmental error traditional religious knowledge is not enough. One must be familiar with other fields of knowledge as well especially Marxism and modern psychology. Knowledge of Marxism is important for understanding the actual nature of error and that of modern psychology is necessary for determining its magnitude. A deep study of the history of Marxism will lead us to a clear understanding of the state of the affairs that emerges as a consequence of a partial truth becoming the ultimate truth and as a result of a preacher's call turning into interpretative philosophy. Study of modern psychology will help us understand how influences at a subconscious level eventually take the shape of rigid ideology without us being fully aware of it.)*

Unfortunately Jama'at-e-Islami did to me what others had done to it erroneously. The critics of the Jama'at treated it as one of the deviant groups as we have mentioned above and gave their verdict against it accordingly. Similarly the Jama'at looked at my constructive criticism as an antagonistic attack against itself like others. It did to me what others had done to it. It is quite obvious that the response to a criticism cannot be worthwhile if the very nature of that criticism is not understood correctly.

When I look at the responses that have come on behalf of the Jam'aat against my writings I feel that a wrestler has started an imaginary fight in an empty arena in front of spectators and his own admirers without there being any opponent. The responses may have been from senior leaders or from junior members, written or oral, published or unpublished, all are full of irrelevant arguments or attacks against me by presenting my point of view in a twisted fashion. Certain writings show that the writers have no idea of how to make a valid argument in the heat of their reaction and response. Some are just rhetorical and others contain nothing but taunts and ridicule to compensate for a lack of scholarly argumentation. Ordinary readers are not always able to discriminate between ridicule and academic arguments.

I would also explain that Maulana Maududi's literature on this issue is not a deliberate attempt at twisting the Islamic ideology. It happened in a subconscious manner and resulted from a specific and dominant way of thinking and forming opinion on Maulana's part. He went on to explain the entire ideology of religion in his specific way with the intention of serving the religion and not in any negative way. This far I consider him to be innocent. However, if the scholar is made aware of the situation resulting from his interpretation then it is mandatory for him to deliberate upon it and not just ignore constructive criticism by considering his opinion as the final word. Making a mistake is not a mistake. It becomes a real mistake when a person insists on it even when the nature of his error is explained to him.

I am fully aware that an acknowledgement of error under current situation is not a simple thing. There are many subtle issues involved here. Before the first publication of my book I asked the senior members of the Jama'at several times for something very simple. Had they accepted it then or if they do it now, the series of arguments ad counter arguments would end in view of the common benefit from a religious stand even though the issue of whether the interpretation is valid or not as a matter of principle would still remain.

I put forward two suggestions in my book, one related to Maulana Maududi and the other connected with his Jama'at. I suggested that Maulana should declare that the concept of religion that he has presented in his writings is not an absolute interpretation of the religious ideology but it represents his particular emphasis in view of the state of affairs at that time. (تعبیر کی غلطی) page 9) If he did it (*Maulana Maududi was alive when this book was written*) then we will have a basis to explain his writings in a different way.

The second suggestion relates to the Jama'at-e-Islami itself that it should issue an official acknowledgement that 'the writings of Maulana Maududi do not constitute an authentic exposition of Jama'at's outlook'. (تعییر کی غلطی page 130)

If it did happen it would have changed the status of Maulana's writings from being central to being an adjunct to the official position of Jama'at-e-Islami on this important issue. If Maulana's own literature was still used it would be for its usefulness just like other books recommended by the Jama'at in its circle of studies. It will no longer be an official version of Jama'at's thought process. (For details please see تعییر کی غلطی page 52 to 137)

I presented these suggestions very clearly before the publication of my book as well as in it. Even though my demand was less than what was required my suggestions were not accepted either due to excessive bias or a lack of sensible thinking.

I am well aware that practically speaking Maulana's writings are being marginalized in his own Jama'at and perhaps it is only a matter of time before their status would be reduced to that of a sacred monument whose disrespect would be an unforgivable crime but which would have nothing to do with actual practice just like what happened to Marx. In socialist circles Marx's words carry the sanctity of revelation but in reality his writings only decorate the bookshelves of libraries. What is being practiced is someone else's agenda.

The unnatural and unrealistic interpretation of a truth goes through a historical process. It influences a generation for a limited time period and then embarks upon a slow decline till it gets buried in libraries like ancient documents. This will be the inevitable fate of Maulana Maududi's literature under discussion. Its inheritors and guardians cannot stop the historical process. However, it would be to their great credit and fortune if they themselves acknowledge its inevitability.

## MENTALITY AT WORK

A consistent result can be expected if molted material is put into a mold. Colored microscopic glasses produced in a factory would show objects in the same color. But human beings are made of different material. Despite logical explanation and presentation of incontrovertible evidence it cannot be expected reliably that a person would accept the argument as proven. In other words human eye is a complex instrument. One person's eyes perceive an object as white while another one perceives it as black. The reason for this difference among human beings is that predetermined way of thinking carries a heavy influence on how people understand and form opinions. When a person reads something, he is not reading it in a completely objective and detached manner. He reads it in the background of his previously established mentality. This explains how two individuals with different mentalities form two opposite opinions about the same thing.

Let me give an example that to explain this view further.

In the preface to my book 'The challenge of modern knowledge' I have acknowledged my indebtedness to Maulana Maududi. Even though I have ideological difference with him but it does not imply that I should deny what I benefited from him despite the difference of opinion on the current issue.

What I wrote has been quoted by two magazines in their reviews but in totally different ways. First let's see what the magazine Faran writes:

"Respectable Waheeduddin Khan is a religious scholar of high repute. He has read widely and has deep knowledge. By the grace of God, he leads a religious life with devotion and humility. He writes in the preface to his book:

"It is an interesting coincidence that this book is connected with two great personalities who have been considered the most prominent icons of religion in India and Pakistan over the last quarter century, namely, Maulana Abul A'ala Maududi and Maulana Syed Abul Hassan Ali Nadavi. It is mainly due to Maulana Maududi that about fifteen years ago at a sensitive point in my life I found a strong motivation to devote myself to the service of religion. This book is a proof of his influence and association. Maulana Nadvi represents the beautiful end of this beginning since it is due to his astute guidance that this book reached its completion in its current form."

The reviewer goes on to write:

“Such an elaborate acknowledgement is a proof of its writer’s nobility, sincerity and upholding of truth. This is the opposite of what we see in the world these days. Students avoid their teachers and do not want to give any credit to their mentors.”

The nobility, sincerity and upholding of truth that the magazine Faran noted in the writer (Maulana Waheeduddin) was not what the other mentality saw. I am referring to the comments published in the magazine Life (زندگی) that quotes the same excerpt from my book but with a totally different interpretation.

“The learned writer (Maulana Waheeduddin) writes towards the end of the preface to this book:

“It is mainly due to Maulana Maududi that about fifteen years ago at a sensitive point in my life I found a strong motivation to devote myself to the service of religion. This book is a proof of his influence and association.”

(The reviewer then writes)

“This passage reminds me of the following couplet

کس نیاموخت علم تیر از من  
که مرا عاقبت نشانه نه کرد

No one should learn archery from me  
I have never been the target of any catastrophe

زندگی September 1966

The readers can see for themselves. The same words show nobility, sincerity and upholding of truth to the discerning eye of reviewer while another one finds valuable material for taunting and insinuation. One finds the fragrance of humanity at its best while another one sees a manifestation of abominable character. One acknowledges it as something commendable while another one finds it worthy of seething criticism and ridicule.

This is how most things work. Correct mentality is a prerequisite for proper understanding of an issue and for forming a reasonable opinion on it. If mentality is not right then correct opinion cannot be formed despite the availability of relevant facts.